1

Doc. #139. Thereafter, French filed the present motions. See Doc. ##172, 173, 174, 178, 180.

of a clerical error in which the court identified the wrong date of a prior filing. The court has

reviewed French's motion and finds that it is without merit. The clerical error does not affect the

validity of the order or its outcome in any way or manner. Accordingly, the court shall deny the

The court shall address each motion below.

2 3

II. Motion to Strike Court's Order (Doc. #172)

4 5

6

8

motion to strike.

III. **Motion for Production of Witness Statements (Doc. #173)**

10

11

French seeks an order from the court requiring the United States provide any and all pretrial statements made by any government witnesses who testified at trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3500.

United States to produce any statement of the witness in possession of the United States which

relates to the subject matter as to which the witness testified." 18 U.S.C. § 3500(b). However, such

production of statements "is not automatic." *United States v. Hanna*, 55 F.3d 1456, 1459 (9th Cir.

1995). A defendant must request the production of pretrial statements during trial after the witness

Accordingly, the court shall deny his motion for production. See Burke, 506 F.2d at 1168 ("[T]he

Here, the court finds that French's request for documents is untimely. French did not move

has testified. See United States v. Burke, 506 F.2d 1165, 1168 (9th Cir. 1974).

the court for the production of pretrial statements until after his conviction and appeal.

burden rests upon the defendant to invoke the statute at the appropriate time ").

18 U.S.C. § 3500 provides that, on motion by the defendant, a district court shall "order the

French seeks an order striking the court's October 21, 2010 order (Doc. #156) on the basis

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

IV. **Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #174)**

23

24

25

26

French moves for summary judgment on his renewed motion for a new trial (Doc. #158). On March 4, 2011, the court issued an order on French's motion. See Doc. #183. Therefore, in light

of the court's order, the court finds that French's present motion for summary judgment is moot.

2

1 V. Motion for Law Library Materials (Doc. ##178, 180) 2 For a period of time in early 2011, French was housed at the Washoe County Detention Center, a state facility without a law library, while he was awaiting trial for a separate criminal 3 4 charge. During that time, French filed the present motions for law library access, as well as a 5 similar motion in the other criminal action. 6 Initially, the court notes that trial has concluded in the other action and French has been 7 transferred back to a federal facility with a law library. Thus, because French is no longer housed 8 at the Washoe County Detention Center, there is no longer a need for the court to provide him with 9 legal materials and library access. Accordingly, the court shall deny French's motions as moot. 10 11 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant's motion to strike (Doc. #172) and motion 12 for production of witness statements (Doc. #173) are DENIED. 13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. #174) 14 and motions for law library access (Doc. ##178, 180) are DENIED as moot. 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. Fldihe 16 DATED this 18th day of March, 2011. 17 18 LARRY R. HICKS 19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25 26